



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/966,122	09/28/2001	Jerlyn R. Culp	10017934-1	4439

7590 04/02/2004  
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

LEROUX, ETIENNE PIERRE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2171

DATE MAILED: 04/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/966,122

Applicant(s)

CULP ET AL.

Examiner

Etienne P LeRoux

Art Unit

2171

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 February 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5-11,14-17 and 20-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5-11,14-17 and 20-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 September 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 3, 20-23, 25, 26 and 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Pat No 6,101,480 issued to Conmy et al (hereafter Conmy).

Claims 1, 20-23, 25, 26 and 28-30:

Conmy '480 discloses:

- an interface [server 204, Fig 1] configured to receive a calendar source list generated by a first party, the calendar source list comprising at least one of a source, a delivery format, and a delivery method, wherein the source includes information compiled by a second party [calendar file for each invitee, col 3, lines 40-45]
- a collection and distribution unit for accessing the source and retrieving calendar data in accordance with said calendar source list via said interface [internet, Fig 1]
- logic configured to incorporate retrieved calendar data into a calendar database in accordance with said calendar source list [coordinator schedules an event. col 3, lines 27-37]

Claim 3:

Conmy discloses wherein said calendar database is associated with a subscribing party and integrates calendar information from an unrelated calendar source [col 3, lines 38-43].

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2, 5-8, 10, 11 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Conmy in view of US Pat No 5,761,525 issued to Williams (hereafter Williams).

Claim 2:

Conmy discloses the elements of claim 1 as noted above.

Conmy fails to disclose capturing calendar information via optical character recognition.

Williams discloses capturing calendar information via optical character recognition [Fig 1, 118]

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Conmy to include capturing calendar information via optical character recognition as taught by Williams.

The ordinarily skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify Conmy per the above for the purpose of inputting data which can be read by the processor [col 2, lines 60-65].

Claim 5:

The combination of Conmy and Williams discloses the elements of claim 2 as noted above.

Williams discloses a scanner [Fig 1, 118]

Art Unit: 2171

Claim 6:

The combination of Conmy and Williams discloses the elements of claim 2 as noted above.

Williams discloses wherein said logic is configured to convert said image information into a data file [col 2, lines 60-65]

Claim 7:

The combination of Conmy and Williams discloses the elements of claim 2 as noted above.

Williams discloses wherein logic is configured to convert said image information into text [col 2, lines 60-65]

Claim 8:

The combination of Conmy and Williams discloses the elements of claims 2 and 3 as noted above.

Williams discloses logic configured to transfer calendar information in accordance with the delivery format and delivery method [col 2, lines 60-65]

Claim 10:

The combination of Conmy and Williams discloses the elements of claims 2, 3 and 8 as noted above.

Williams discloses a local area network [Fig 1].

Claim 11:

The combination of Conmy and Williams discloses the elements of claims 2, 7 and 8 as noted above.

Art Unit: 2171

Conmy discloses a wide area network [Fig 1].

Claim 14:

Conmy discloses the elements of claim 1 as noted above.

Conmy fails to disclose wherein said calendar data comprises text format data.

Williams discloses text format data [Fig 3A, item 245 and col 4, lines 10-14]

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Conmy

Claim 15:

Conmy discloses the elements of claim 1 as noted above.

Conmy fails to disclose wherein said calendar data comprises vCard compliant data.

Official Notice is taken that vCard<sup>1</sup> compliant data is well-known and expected in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Williams '525 to include vCard compliant data for the purpose of converting optical character recognition data into editable format data.

Claims 9 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Conmy and Williams and further in view of Pub No US 2003/0004776 issued to Perella et al (hereafter Perella).

Claim 9:

The combination of Conmy and Williams discloses the elements of claims 2, 7 and 8 as noted above.

---

<sup>1</sup> Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF) publications RFC 2425 and RFC 2426.

Art Unit: 2171

The combination of Conmy and Williams fails to disclose wherein said interface comprises a wireless interface.

Perella discloses a wireless interface [abstract]

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Conmy and Perella to include a wireless interface as taught by Perella.

The ordinarily skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify the combination of Conmy and Perella per the above for the purpose of providing suitable communications for a mobile device [abstract].

Claims 16, 17 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Conmy in view of Pub No US 2002/0093540 issued to Mariani et al (hereafter Mariani).

Claim 16:

Conmy discloses the elements of claim 1 as noted above.

Conmy fails to disclose wherein said calendar data comprises html format data.

Mariani '540 discloses wherein said calendar data comprises html format data [paragraph 23]

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Conmy to include wherein said calendar data comprises html format data as taught by Mariani '540.

The ordinarily skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify Conmy per the above for the purpose of interfacing with the internet [paragraph 23].

Art Unit: 2171

Claims 17 and 24:

Conmy discloses the elements of claim 1 as noted above.

Conmy fails to disclose wherein said calendar data comprises data specifying a World Wide Web address associated with a calendar source.

Mariani '540 discloses wherein said calendar data comprises data specifying a World Wide Web address associated with a calendar source [paragraph 23]

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Conmy to include wherein said calendar data comprises data specifying a World Wide Web address associated with a calendar source as taught by Mariani '540.

The ordinarily skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify Conmy per the above for the purpose of interfacing with the internet.

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 2/27/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

**First Applicant Argument:**

Applicant states in paragraph 3, on page 8 "Specifically, Conmy fails to disclose, teach, or suggest Applicants' claimed interface configured to receive 'a calendar source list generated by a first party, the calendar source list comprising at least one of a source, a delivery format, and a delivery method, wherein the source includes information compiled by a second party.'"

**First Examiner Response:**

Examiner is not persuaded. The following excerpt from Conmy, column 3, lines 38-43 and 57-65 reads on supra claim limitation:

According to an embodiment of the present invention, some or all of the users and their network addresses for a plurality of domains are stored in a name and address database or file, preferably on a server associated with that domain. **Stored with each name and address file is a calendar file and a profile for a plurality of potential invitees.**

5

FIG. 1 depicts a system according to an embodiment of the present invention. According to this embodiment, the system of FIG. 1 may comprise one or more databases 200 having stored thereon one or more profiles 202, **one or more calendar files 210** and one or more name and addresses files 212.

6

Name and addresses files 212 may comprise a list all of the names and electronic mail addresses for a plurality or all of the users on an electronic calendar system. A name and address file may be created for each invitee. For example, conference rooms, equipment, and other resources may be included as invitees.

7

Profiles 202 may comprise information regarding **each invitee's work hours on a day to day basis (and hence his or her non-work hours), as well as the time zone in which he or she works, the physical location where he or she works, and the hours of that location. Other availability information about each invitee may be stored in the profile 202.**

### Other Applicant Arguments

Applicant repeats above argument on pages 13.

### Examiner Response:

Applicant is referred to supra examiner response.

### *Conclusion*

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 2171

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Etienne LeRoux whose telephone number is (703) 305-0620.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday – Friday from 8:00 AM to 4:30 PM.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic, can be reached on (703) 308-1436.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Patent related correspondence can be forwarded via the following FAX number (703) 872-9306

Etienne LeRoux

3/31/2004



SAFET METJAHIC  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EX.  
TECHNOLOGICAL CENTER